

STATUS OF CLAIMS

Claims 6-25 are pending.

Claims 6-25 stand rejected by the Examiner.

Claims 6 and 11 have been amended without prejudice herein.

Claims 17-20 have been cancelled without prejudice herein.

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

Claim for Priority

Applicant has amended the first sentence in the subject application without prejudice, to explicitly recite that the subject application is a continuation-in-part application. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully deems objections to the specification based on a defective priority claim overcome.

As the prior claim for priority to U.S. patent application Ser. No. 10/440,521 in the subject application was acknowledged in the July 22, 2008 Office action, Applicant believes a separate petition to accept an unintentionally delayed priority claim is not required. Should one be required, Applicant requests the Examiner indicate in the next Office action that such a petition is required regardless of the priority claim being acknowledged, and Applicant will submit a suitable petition.

Abstract

Applicant has amended the Abstract without prejudice to better comply with applicable rules. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully deems objections to the abstract overcome.

Claim Objections

Claim 11 stands objected to pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Applicant confirms the prior listing of the claims included an inadvertent typographical error in reciting "distribution". Applicant has corrected the listing of Claim 11 herein. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully deems this objection overcome.

35 U.S.C. 112 and 101 Rejections

Claims 6-25 stand rejected as being directed to disembodied software. Applicant has amended Claim 6, without prejudice, to recite, “[a] planning system being embodied in a computer readable medium and comprising” Accordingly, Applicant submits each of the systems of the now pending claims are expressly embodied in a computer readable medium, and requests reconsideration and removal of these rejections.

Double Patenting Rejections

Claims 6-13, 18 and 20 stand provisionally rejected on the ground of obviousness-type double patenting over amended Claims 1, 3-5, 10-11, 13 and 15-16 of copending Application No. 10/949,890.

Applicant respectfully elects to postpone the filing of any terminal disclaimers until allowances are granted in the related application, and all other grounds of rejection have been removed.

35 U.S.C. 102 and 103 Rejections

Claims 6-11, 13-16, 19-22 and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being anticipated by Beckhardt (United States Patent No. 6,085,166). Claims 12, 17-18, 23 and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Beckhardt. Applicant requests reconsideration and removal of these rejections for at least the following reasons.

Claim 6 is anticipated by Beckhardt pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 102 only if each and every element set forth therein is found in Beckhardt. *See, Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987)*). The claimed embodiments of the present invention provide for meeting planning. Advantageously, the claimed embodiments of the present invention generate a meeting “***in accordance with the at least one business rule and the at least one priority designation.***” Beckhardt fails to teach generating a meeting in accordance with at least one business rule and at least one priority designation, and hence fails to anticipate Claim 6 as a matter of law.

“Business rule” as recited by Claim 6 is not mere system logic. Instead, the subject application uses “business rule” in its conventional sense as a rule by which an organization operates, a statement that constrains an aspect of a business and/or a business operation reflected

in a database design. *See, e.g., Specification, par [223]; see also, Attachment "A".* The subject application's "business rules" are taught to associate meeting parameters with one-another. For example, if a particular funding source for a meeting is selected, like a marketing department, a business rule associated with the selected funding source may restrict budget and/or recruiting parameters. *See, e.g., Specification, par [223].* The claimed embodiments of the present invention constrain meeting planning using such "business rules".

Advantageously, the recited system of Claim 6 also generates meetings in accordance with at least one priority designation. By way of non-limiting example, and as is explained at par. [117] of the subject application, a client may prioritize the specifics of a given meeting such that weight may be allotted to various preferences. In this way, a client may be able to select a preferred date, speaker, venue speakers, dollars spent and room specifics, for example, and the system may weight each choice such as to accommodate as many preferences as possible while still meeting the client's meeting requirement and preferences. By way of further non-limiting example, and as is still described at par. [117], a client may wish to have the best audio visual equipment for a given cost, such as \$500. Venue information may be included in a database, and may contain information such as the shape of the room such as, u-shaped, for example, and an ability to provide or setup a registration table, which factors of the meeting location may affect available or acceptable options related to the meeting, such as particular types of A/V, or time frame for registration, for example.

Thus, well-ordered and constrained meeting planning is achieved in the claimed embodiments in accordance with both: (1) at least one business rule, and (2) at least one priority designation. The Office action argues Beckhardt teaches a planning system that utilizes at least one business rule at Figs. 3 and 4. *See, 07/22/2008 Office action, pgs. 9-10.* Applicant traverses this assertion.

Beckhardt does not teach, or even suggest for that matter, using any business rules. Instead, Beckhardt proposes at Fig. 3: generating a request by selecting desired invitees, date, time and duration; accessing invitee availability; and determining whether each invitee is available. *See, U.S. Pat. 6,085,166, col. 5, l. 15 - col. 6, l. 14.* Beckhardt proposes at Fig. 4, that if no time interval during which all invitees are available exists, the system determines a "best fit". *See, U.S. Pat. 6,085,166, col. 6, ll. 15-17.* The "best fit" process of Fig. 4 includes:

assigning a weight to each invitee, assigning an unavailability weight for each time interval within a requested range, and choosing an available time interval based on the lowest weighted value. *See, U.S. Pat. 6,085,166, col. 6, l. 17-20 col. 7, l. 15.*

Thus, in the methodology of Fig. 3 Beckhardt merely proposes setting desired meeting parameters, and checking to see if invitees are available. No business rules are used -- instead simple logic is applied. And, the methodology of Fig. 4 of Beckhardt merely weights invitees and times, and also fails to propose or use any business rules what-so-ever.

Accordingly, Beckhardt fails to teach each of the recited elements of Claim 6, namely, at least, "a meeting editor, wherein at least one meeting is generated for the at least one client by the meeting editor in accordance with the at least one business rule and the at least one priority designation." Wherefore, Applicant requests reconsideration and removal of the rejection of Claim 6.

Applicant also requests reconsideration and removal of the rejections of Claims 7-16 and 21-25, at least by virtue of these claims' ultimate dependency upon a patently distinct base Claim 6.

CONCLUSION

Wherefore, Applicant believes that all outstanding grounds raised by the Examiner have been addressed and respectfully submits the present case is in condition for allowance, early notification of which is earnestly solicited.

Should there be any questions or outstanding matters, the Examiner is cordially invited and requested to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney at his number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Jonathan M. Darcy/
Jonathan M. Darcy
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 44,054
(215) 446-6283

Gibbons P.C.
1700 Two Logan Square
18th & Arch Streets
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103

ATTACHMENT A

[Web](#) [Images](#) [Video](#) [News](#) [Maps](#) [Gmail](#) [more ▾](#)[Sign in](#)

Google

define: business rule

[Advanced Search](#)[Preferences](#)New! [View and manage your web history](#)**Web**Definitions of **business rule** on the Web:

- A rule under which an organization operates. A policy or decision that influences the process step.
www.georgetown.edu/uis/ia/dw/GLOSSARY0816.html
- A business rule is a statement that defines or constrains some aspect of the business.
www.haley.com/resources/Glossary.html
- A bussiness operation reflected in the design of a database
www.microsoft-accesssolutions.co.uk/glossary.htm

Find definitions of **business rule** in: [English](#) [Italian](#) [all languages](#)

define: business rule

[Language Tools](#) | [Search Tips](#) | [Dissatisfied? Help us improve](#)©2007 Google - [Google Home](#) - [Advertising Programs](#) - [Business Solutions](#) - [About Google](#)